

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE 5312 10/633,662 08/05/2003 Berthold Kessler 1739-0175P **EXAMINER** 2292 7590 11/02/2005 BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH STAFIRA, MICHAEL PATRICK **PO BOX 747** ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

2877

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

P
U -

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Applicant(s)	V
KESSLER ET AL.	
Art Unit	
2877	
•	KESSLER ET AL. Art Unit

-				
	Michael P. Stafira	2877		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress	
THE REPLY FILED <u>06 October 2005</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.				
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods.	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)	
time periods: a) The period for reply expires <u>3 months from the mailing date</u>		•		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.				
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	06.07(f).			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).				
NOTICE OF APPEAL	" "H 07 OFD 44 07 must be	Clard the last transmit	a af the data of	
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).				
AMENDMENTS 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because				
 (a) They raise new issues that would require further co 	ensideration and/or search (see NO	TE below):	00000	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below		,		
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	tter form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying	the issues for	
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		ected claims.		
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		moliant Amendment	(PTOL-324)	
		impliant Amendment	(1 102 024).	
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the				
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 				
 For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro 	will not be entered, or b) wivided below or appended.	ll be entered and an e	explanation of	
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:				
Claim(s) allowed:				
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:				
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE				
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, by because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	ut before or on the date of filing a N nd sufficient reasons why the affidat	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> vit or other evidence i	ot be entered s necessary and	
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar 	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe ry and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa see 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).	
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attac	ned.	
The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:	
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s).				
13. Other:		Michael P. Stafira	>	
		Primary Examiner		

Art Unit: 2877

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The remarks dated 10/6/2005 have been considered by the examiner. Applicant is correct in that the stop of Jurca blocks light from the welding pool, but since applicant's claim or specification fails to disclose what the selection of a given field of observation in the region of the interaction zone is, such as light through an aperture stop which produces a round circular light depending on the size of the aperture. The stop of Jurca does prevent direct light from the zone but, does not totally block light from the zone reading on applicants claim of the detector receiving light from a selection of a given field of observation. Jurca clearly shows that the stop blocks certain light but allows other light from the region to pass to the detector, therefore the combination of Kurosawa and Jurca are proper.